

REMARKS

Dealing with preliminary matters first, in the first paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that the non-patentable literature cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of January 24, 2005, was not considered because copies were not provided. The Examiner should have received copies from the International Bureau. Nonetheless, Applicants re-submit herewith copies of the references.

Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 4-7 have been rejected under § 112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite. Additionally, claims 1-3, 7 and 9 have been rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dando (U.S. Patent No. 6,127,926). Additionally, claims 8 and 10 have been rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dando in view of Fufido, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,720,874). On the other hand, Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that the claims 4-6 contain allowable subject matter.

With respect to the § 112 (second paragraph) rejection, the Examiner contends that the phrase “a start time of the specific time zone” and “an end time of the specific time zone” as used in claims 4-7 are unclear and, therefore, indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner has interpreted the term “time zone” to correspond to the time zones around the world (e.g., Japan time zone, Eastern time zone in the U.S., etc.). However, Applicants note that this is not the intent of the invention. More specifically, the time zone setting device is intended to set a specific time *period* during which the security check must be made (e.g., beginning three hours after sunset). Therefore, in order to clarify the claimed invention, Applicants have amended the

specification and the claims by changing the term “zone” to “period.” Thus, for example, this limitation of claim 1 will recites as follows:

a time period setting device for setting a specific time period during which a security check must be made.

With respect to claim 4, Applicants submit that a start time and an end time are different because they are determined based on respective different lengths of time passed subsequent to sunset.

Turning to the rejection of claim 1 based on Dando, Applicants submit that there is no disclosure in the reference of a time period setting device for setting a specific time period during which a security check must be made. Rather, Dando is simply directed to an intrusion sensing system which is not overly sensitive such that objects moving along the ground do not trigger the security system. *See, claim 1 of Dando.* In the Office Action, the Examiner refers to column 10, lines 46-51 and column 13, lines 15-19, as disclosing the time zone setting device. However, we disagree with the Examiner. Specifically, the disclosure in column 10, lines 46-51, merely states as follows:

As an intruder attempts to enter the protected area a siren and pulsating strobe light is immediately activated for a predetermined time usually 1 to 3 minutes, the siren to then shut down the entire system to automatically re-arm.

Thus, this disclosure is completely unrelated to a time period setting device for setting a specific time period during which a security check must be made. Rather, this disclosure merely relates to the amount of time during which the warning system remains on when the alarm is activated.

With respect to the disclosure of column 13, lines 15-19, this disclosure states as follows:

8. Option The control equipment on site will facilitate the computer access of the memory unit (down loading) by the Central Monitoring Station via the communication. The functions may be remotely analyzed, checked, and reprogrammed by authorised personnel if required.

As can be appreciated from this disclosure, it is entirely unrelated to a time period setting device as recited in claim 1. In fact, the reference specifically states that the system is operable for the full 24 hours of a day. *See*, column 12, lines 47-48. Thus, there is absolutely no disclosure in the reference of setting a specific time period during which the security check is made.

In short, Applicants respectfully submit that Dando only discloses a time measuring device for setting an amount of time during which a warning system remains on or for avoiding false alarms, but is silent about time period setting device for setting a specific time period during which a security check must be made.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the § 102 rejection of claim 1 based on Dando is entirely unsupported. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 should be allowable over Dando. Furthermore, since all claims depend from claim 1, they should likewise be allowable.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Serial No.: 10/522,135
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC Ref: Q85896

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian W. Hannon
Registration No. 32,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 11, 2006